

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/666,281

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Tony Mahmoudi

Art Unit

2175

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Samuel Ntiros.(3) Tony Mahmoudi.(2) Sam Rimell.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 27 August 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 14, and 19.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

As requested by the attorney during the previous interview conducted on 14-April-2004, the examiner called the attorney upon receipt of the amendments filed on 29-April-2004. The examiner indicated that the new dependent claims 21-23 added by the applicant would not put the independent claims 1, 14 and 19 in a better condition for allowance. Further, the examiner suggested that incorporating the previously "objected to" dependent claims (for containing allowable subject matter) into the independent claims, or re-writing the "objected to" claims in independent form, would place the application in a better form for allowance. The attorney faxed to the examiner an amendment, authorized to be entered as an "examiner's amendment".